

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA  
SOUTHERN DIVISION  
Case No. 7:23-CR-00039-M

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

MARCUS TERRELL BURNEY,

Defendant.

This matter comes before the court on Defendant's letter dated February 13, 2025, and filed on March 7, 2025, in which Defendant appears to provide additional information related to his second motion to suppress. DE 81. After a full evidentiary hearing on February 3, 2025, and supplemental briefing by both parties, the court issued its order denying the motion on February 26, 2025. DE 78.

To the extent that the present letter may be construed as a motion, the court, for the third time, reminds Defendant that because he is represented by counsel, the court is under no obligation to consider motions or other documents filed pro se by a represented party. *See United States v. Hammond*, 821 F. App'x 203, 207 (4th Cir. 2020) (citing *McKaskle v. Wiggins*, 465 U.S. 168, 183 (1984) and *United States v. Carranza*, 645 F. App'x 297, 300 (4th Cir. 2016)). Accordingly, such motion is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE to defense counsel's ability to re-file a request for relief, if so desired.

SO ORDERED this 10<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2025.

  
RICHARD E. MYERS II  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE